

## REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments, and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claim 1 is currently being amended. The amendment to claim 1 is to improve its readability and does not change its scope. New claims 19-21 have been added. No new matter is being added.

This amendment changes and adds claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-8 and 12-21 are now pending in this application.

### ***Foreign priority***

Applicant again respectfully requests the Examiner to acknowledge applicant's claim to foreign priority.

### ***Allowable subject matter***

Applicant appreciates the indication that claims 1-8 are allowed.

### ***Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

Claims 12-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,265,783 to Juso ("Juso"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 12 recites "a dummy bump electrode formed above said insulating layer, and connected to associated one of said plurality of external bump electrodes." Juso fails to disclose or suggest at least this feature of claim 12 in the context of that claim.

Juso discloses a device with an interconnection protective film 7, lands 10, and dummy lands 11 (See Figure 1). External connection terminals 4, formed as solder balls, are connected to respective of the lands 10, but not to the dummy lands 11 in the device of Figure

1 (col. 5, lines 14-22). Juso also discloses an embodiment where the “dummy lands 11 are utilized to partly form signal interconnections as shown in FIG. 5(b).” (col. 6, lines 42-43).

In contrast to the device of claim 12, however, and as discussed in the Amendment and Reply filed on September 19, 2005, Juso does not disclose a dummy bump electrode, much less a dummy bump electrode in the arrangement recited. The Final Office Action equates the dummy lands 11 with the dummy bump electrode of claim 12. The dummy lands 11, however, are not bump electrodes. While the external connection terminals 4, to which the lands 10 are connected, are formed as solder balls, and thus might be considered to be bump electrodes, the dummy lands 11 are of a similar size and shape to the lands 10, and are not of a shape to be considered to be bump electrodes. Thus, Juso, failing to disclose the bump electrodes of claim 12, fails to anticipate that claim.

One skilled in the art would not consider the lands 11 of Juso to be bump electrodes. As is well known in the art, bump electrodes, such as those formed of solder balls, have a “bump” shape. By contrast the lands 11 of Juso are essentially flat in nature. Juso specifically discloses that the size and shape of the lands 11 are similar to that of the lands 10 (See col. 5, lines 23-27), which are also essentially flat in nature. Claim terms must be interpreted from the view of one skilled in art, and applicants submit that one skilled in the art would not consider the essentially flat lands 11 of Juso to be bump electrodes.

Further, the Office Action is not consistent in its interpretation of the lands 11 of Juso to be bump electrodes, and at the same time the lands 10 to be pads. As discussed above, Juso discloses the lands 10 and 11 to be the same size and shape. Thus, if the Office Action interprets the lands 10 to be pads, a consistent interpretation of Juso would require that the lands 11 also be considered to be pads, not bump electrodes.

Dependent claims 13-18 ultimately depend from claim 12, and are patentable for at least the same reasons as well as for further patentable features recited therein.

***New claims 19-21***

Claims 19-21 have been added, and are likewise believed to patentably distinguish over Juso.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to

Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R.

§ 1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date November 18, 2005

By 

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 672-5407  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

David A. Blumenthal  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 26,257

Thomas G. Bilodeau  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 43,438